

APPEAL NO. 032267
FILED OCTOBER 7, 2003

This appeal arises pursuant to the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, TEX. LAB. CODE ANN. § 401.001 *et seq.* (1989 Act). A contested case hearing was held on August 4, 2003. The hearing officer resolved the disputed issues by deciding that the compensable injury of _____, does not extend to include an injury to the appellant's (claimant) cervical, thoracic, and lumbar spines in the form of spondylosis and possible disc disease; and to swelling and dysfunction of both legs, as well as hemorrhoidal disorder. The claimant appealed the hearing officer's extent-of-injury determination based on sufficiency of the evidence grounds. The respondent (carrier) responded, urging affirmance.

DECISION

Affirmed.

The claimant attached documents to his appeal, some of which were not admitted into evidence at the hearing. Documents submitted for the first time on appeal are generally not considered unless they constitute newly discovered evidence. See *generally* Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Appeal No. 93111, decided March 29, 1993; Black v. Wills, 758 S.W.2d 809 (Tex. App.-Dallas 1988, no writ). In determining whether new evidence submitted with an appeal requires remand for further consideration, the Appeals Panel considers whether the evidence came to the knowledge of the party after the hearing, whether it is cumulative of other evidence of record, whether it was not offered at the hearing due to a lack of diligence, and whether it is so material that it would probably result in a different decision. See Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Appeal No. 93536, decided August 12, 1993. Upon our review, we cannot agree that the evidence meets the requirements of newly discovered evidence, in that the claimant did not show that the new evidence submitted for the first time on appeal could not have been obtained prior to the hearing or that its inclusion in the record would probably result in a different decision. The evidence, therefore, does not meet the standard for newly discovered evidence and will not be considered.

It is undisputed that the claimant sustained a compensable lumbar sprain/strain injury on _____. At issue was whether the compensable injury extends to include an injury to the cervical, thoracic, and lumbar spine in the form of spondylosis and possible disc disease; and to swelling and dysfunction of both legs, as well as hemorrhoidal disorder. Extent of injury is a question of fact for the hearing officer to resolve. It was for the hearing officer, as the trier of fact, to resolve the conflicts and inconsistencies in the evidence and to determine what facts had been established. Garza v. Commercial Insurance Company of Newark, New Jersey, 508 S.W.2d 701 (Tex. Civ. App.-Amarillo 1974, no writ). This is equally true regarding medical evidence. Texas Employers Insurance Association v. Campos, 666 S.W.2d 286 (Tex. App.-Houston [14th Dist.] 1984, no writ). The trier of fact may believe all, part, or none of the

testimony of any witness. Taylor v. Lewis, 553 S.W.2d 153, 161 (Tex. Civ. App.-Amarillo 1977, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Aetna Insurance Co. v. English, 204 S.W.2d 850 (Tex. Civ. App.-Fort Worth 1947, no writ). The hearing officer noted that the claimant failed to show that within a reasonable medical probability the damage in his lumbar spine was caused by the _____, incident and that there is a significant lack of medical records to support cervical or thoracic injuries, swelling and dysfunction of the legs and hemorrhoidal dysfunction caused by the _____, incident. In view of the evidence presented, we cannot conclude that the hearing officer's determination is so against the great weight and preponderance of the evidence as to be clearly wrong or manifestly unjust. Cain v. Bain, 709 S.W.2d 175, 176 (Tex. 1986).

The hearing officer's decision and order are affirmed.

The true corporate name of the insurance carrier is **CONTINENTAL CASUALTY COMPANY** and the name and address of its registered agent for service of process is

**CT CORPORATION
350 NORTH ST. PAUL STREET
DALLAS, TEXAS 75201.**

Margaret L. Turner
Appeals Judge

CONCUR:

Judy L. S. Barnes
Appeals Judge

Elaine M. Chaney
Appeals Judge